

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RICHARD WEDDLE,)	3:14-cv-00241-MMD-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	June 25, 2015
)	
RENEE BAKER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is “Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Defendants’ Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Sanctions 11(c) Be Imposed.” (Doc. # 45.) Defendants have responded. (Doc. # 48.) Because of the patently frivolous nature of Plaintiff’s motion, the court is not going to await the filing of any reply memorandum by Plaintiff.¹

Plaintiff filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction. (Doc. # 35, April 24, 2015.) Defendants are entitled to file a response. LR 7-2(b). Defendants did so. (Doc. # 39, May 8, 2015.) If Plaintiff had any objection to the form or content of Defendants’ opposition, the appropriate place to do so would have been in a reply memorandum. Plaintiff chose not to file any reply memorandum but apparently instead chose to attack Defendants’ Response in the form of a motion to strike.

Motions to strike are authorized under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) as pertaining to “pleadings.” An opposition to a motion for preliminary injunction is not a pleading. Technically, therefore, a motion under Rule 12(f) is not appropriate to attack the content of a “memorandum.” However, to the extent the court may entertain a motion to strike a memorandum such as Defendants’ response, for the reasons stated above, Plaintiff’s motion to strike is rejected. Again, if Plaintiff contends Defendants

¹ This order pertains only to the merits of Plaintiff’s motion to strike (Doc. # 45) and does not address any of the substantive issues related to Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. # 35).

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk